

**AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
For meeting of June 17, 2004**

**Draft**

**MEMBERS  
PRESENT**

Ron Salk  
Alan Fox  
Bruce Alton  
Douglas Haubert  
Bob Luskin  
Carol Soccio  
Don Temple  
Deborah Veady  
Bernhard Clever

**MEMBERS  
ABSENT**

**STAFF  
PRESENT**

Chris Kunze  
Dottie Jones  
Sharon Diggs-Jackson  
Ken Ashmore  
Sileneka Smith  
Christine Edwards  
Steve O'Keefe

**OTHERS  
PRESENT**

Sign-in sheet attached or  
available on request

**Call to Order**

Chair Ron Salk called the Airport Advisory Commission to order at 4:04 p.m., at the Long Beach Energy Department.

**Roll Call**

Mr. Chris Kunze, Airport Manager, called roll and certified that a quorum was present.

**Approval of Minutes**

The Airport Advisory Commission minutes of the meeting of May 27, 2004 were approved as submitted.

**Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was amended to show item #2 Airport Advisory Commission Election of Officers, to provide for elections at the meeting of June 17th versus the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Airport Bureau Staff Report**

- Mr. Ken Ashmore gave the noise report for May 2004. Commissioner Clever asked why the complaint numbers were up in District 5. Mr. Ashmore stated that many were due to helicopter operations, where training operations are straying farther east. Vice-Chair Fox asked about the 12:05 a.m. arrival of JetBlue on 25R. Mr. Ashmore did not have details of the incident but offered to get information for the Commission.
- Chris Kunze gave the monthly activity report for May 2004 and stated that some of the passenger activity is flat versus activity for May of 2003, possibly because of a downgrade in American Airlines equipment to MD-80's from B-757's. He noted that general aviation activity shows a 6% spike over last year. He also noted that cargo is up 2.5%.
- Ms. Christine Edwards gave an update on the Runway 30 construction project. Ms. Edwards stated that the project is progressing smoothly, from a project construction standpoint and from a community notification standpoint. She stated that the project is currently addressing electrical and storm drain infrastructure. She stated that the first

weekend closure will begin at 11:00 p.m. on Friday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, and will continue for the next five consecutive weekends. She stated at that point there will be a break in the weekend closures as the final cap is completed. She stated that the last two weekends of the weekend closures are September 10<sup>th</sup>, and September 17<sup>th</sup>. She stated that the airlines were advised that the construction would avoid holiday weekends, and that Runway 25R will be used on the Saturday closures, and that it is Saturday only that the runway will be closed during the day. There will not be any cargo airline operations. She stated that they expect project completion by December, 2004. Commissioner Alton asked if the financing was federal money, and if some is supported by PFC charges, and if there was any City funding being used for the project. Ms. Edwards stated that it is all federal money and PFC charges with the exception of a small part of the project where they are connecting the FAA approach light system to the building where the system is operated that is not eligible for either PFC or AIP funding. She stated that that piece of the project, at an approximate cost of \$100,000, will come from Airport revenue. She stated that PFC's are being used to fund the City's share of the 10% match on the project and for certain other pieces of the project where they did not expect to get sufficient AIP funding. Commissioner Soccio asked about community awareness regarding the change in the flight pattern, and if a sign could be used as the street repair signs are used. Ms. Edwards stated that if there were sufficient time, they could have a sign posted. Ms. Sharon Diggs-Jackson stated that there are no plans to erect signs, and that it would have to be discussed about what the sign(s) would say, and where they would be placed. She stated that as part of their outreach plan, notices are sent via U.S. mail, with documents that draw attention to being an airport notice. Vice Chair Fox asked if Signal Hill was also informed. Ms. Diggs-Jackson stated that notices are sent to the City but that a direct mailing is not used for Signal Hill. Commissioner Clever asked if the City Council media could be used for notifications or a possible cable TV interview to explain upcoming projects. Ms. Diggs-Jackson stated that she would look into that suggestion. She stated that to complete a full round of outreach, the cost is \$10,000 for each episode. Ms. Edwards stated that the truck haul routes will also impact the community. She stated that during the 33 hours of paving a truck will arrive every 3 minutes for 33 hours straight. She stated that they are planning on noticing every business and a few blocks of residential. She stated that the route is off the 405 freeways, Lakewood Blvd. to Spring St. into the Airport, and then out of the Airport to Redondo Ave. to Willow and on to the 405 freeway. She stated that the second haul route will come off the freeway at Cherry, and into the Airport at Wardlow Road and exit the same route. She stated that TSA will begin construction of two canopies for screening checked baggage. The current canopies permit will expire at the end of June, according to the Fire Department. Commissioner Clever asked if the seven weekend closures would affect helicopter operations. Ms. Edwards stated that there would be some impact requiring coordination by the tower, and that one helipad may have to be shut down due to grading operations. Commissioner Alton asked if there is a glide slope on Runway 25R/7L. Ms. Edwards stated that there is no instrument system, however, there is a visual approach slope indicator on 25R that gives a glide path to the runway.

- Mr. Steve O'Keefe gave an update on the terminal concessions status saying that an orientation meeting was held for interested concessionaires. He stated that 50 participants attended, and of those attending, 18 submitted, 2 withdrew and 14 were qualified for the next stage of submitting a formal request for proposal. He stated that there was a request from the Commission for a survey to be completed by passengers,

and that the Airport Ambassadors/Volunteers are now conducting that survey and that a report of that survey would be given at a future meeting. Mr. O'Keefe also reported on parking Lot D saying that it now consists of 2,042 spaces, and the parking lot is being used regularly. He stated that parking Lot A, the garage, is 1,045 spaces, Lot B, short term parking, is 378 spaces, 65 of which are two-hour parking, Lot C is 601 parking spaces and that total passenger parking available is 4,066. Vice-Chair Fox asked about the permanency of Lot D. Mr. Kunze stated that all Boeing property used is on a month-to-month lease. Commissioner Haubert asked if the concessionaire bids were based on the existing concession space. Mr. O'Keefe stated that they were. Commissioner Haubert asked if the concessionaires would be considered for their ability to provide more services if more space would be allocated. Mr. O'Keefe stated that the selection would consider the capacity to take on additional space. Commissioner Haubert asked if it was stated that there were 14 final bidders. Mr. O'Keefe stated that they are not bidders, but that the 14 qualified for the next round completed a qualifications questionnaire, reviewing minimum qualifications, and that the next step would be a bid. Commissioner Haubert asked if the submittals include concept designs. Mr. O'Keefe stated that they did submit preliminary concepts. Commissioner Haubert asked if those preliminary concepts were open to public inspection. Mr. Kunze stated that the concepts are not public domain at this point because of the competitive nature of the submittals. He stated that if someone was interested, they could do a public records request, then the City Attorney's office would decide what could be given. He stated that staff has also asked for financials, which are normally items that are not available to the public. Commissioner Haubert stated that it might be beneficial, given that the Commission is considering additional concession space, how it may be used. Mr. Kunze stated that given the scenario that a competing company may ask to see what the other 13 have submitted so that it could be used to embellish its own concept, that there would be a problem with that process. Mr. O'Keefe stated that the concepts submitted addressed minimally, and in some cases not at all, any new space. He stated that their task was to assume use of existing space applying their best creativity, and not to count on any future space. Commissioner Haubert stated that it may be very useful to see what can be done with a limited amount of space.

- Mr. Kunze gave an update on the Rates & Fees, saying that staff has developed a six-year financial plan, including ACIP, a capital project plan. He stated that it does not include any of the projects contemplated by the EIR, or the terminal improvements, and that they are basically maintenance and airfield related construction projects. He stated that Leigh-Fisher & Associates have been helpful in reviewing the resources available. He stated that the Airport capital project programs were funded from sources such as FAA discretionary, FAA entitlement, PFC, and the potential of raising user fees to generate additional cash. He stated that staff has developed a Rates & Fees schedule that staff will update the Commission on at a future meeting. He stated that they are looking at a 15% increase in Rates & Fees for the airlines. He stated that the six-year look ahead will be used to have adequate cash flow to fund operations, and to establish a maintenance and operations expense reserve. He stated that these have been put into the funding baseline needed to recover adequate funding, and that there is a three-year program to raise \$2.8 million, with an implementation date beginning October, and that there would be increases on a staged basis, October, January, and April. He stated that the Rates & Fees would go to City Council as part of the budget process which they will be acting on in the next months. Vice-Chair Fox

asked if the City arbitrarily imposes the increases, or negotiated with the airlines. Mr. Kunze stated that there is nothing arbitrary, and that there is a six-year financial plan which identifies the resource needs. He stated that it was known that \$800,00-\$900,00 per year more was needed to fund the CIP projects and all operations. He stated that based on that fact, using a residual cost financing basis, the City would look to the airlines for cost recovery. He stated that those calculations gave precisely how much was needed from the airlines. He stated that some airports have majority interest clauses in the leases, so in order to raise rates and make capital improvements, the majority of airlines have to agree. He stated that LGB has avoided that process, and that they have fees by resolution and month-to-month leases. Commissioner Clever asked if the fees are based on per passenger or by what other means. Mr. Kunze stated that they are all different, and that there is a common use fee, dispersed among the airlines based on enplaned passengers, landing fees based on per 1,000 pounds, certificated max. gross takeoff weight, which is also used for the terminal ramp fee and the RON fee.

### **Old Business**

#### **Douglas Park Land Use Concept Review**

Chairman Salk stated that he would welcome questions from Commissioners to the representatives of Douglas Park or would welcome a motion regarding what the Commission's position should be before a vote is taken.

Commissioner Temple asked Boeing Realty if there had been any changes since the last presentation. Mr. Conk said there were no changes.

Chairman Salk stated that the Commission may want to state simply whether the plan was consistent with Airport operations and land use, and that going beyond that may be not the purview of the Commission, because it involved other studies such as forecast, job creation, and income generation models. He asked if other Commissioners were in agreement with the idea that the Commission only judge Douglas Park from the Airport Advisory Commission's point of view as to whether it is consistent with Airport policy, operations, and land use.

Commissioner Haubert stated that the Land Use Committee, which has spent the most time reviewing Douglas Park, might wish to review the findings. He stated that over the last few meetings he has maintained that he has no position, and would like to hear from the Land Use Committee.

Commissioner Veady stated that the memo submitted at the last meeting summarizes the Committee's findings and that a review of that memo could be helpful to use as a basis for discussion. Commissioner Veady offered to read the memo as follows:

*May 14, 2004*

*To: Long Beach Airport Advisory Commission Members*

*From: Commissioner Bob Luskin, Commissioner Carol Soccio, Commissioner Deborah Veady, Land Use Subcommittee members.*

### *Regarding Boeing PacifiCenter Project*

*This memorandum is in response to a request of April 15, 2004, to recommend an official position for the Airport Advisory Commission regarding the Boeing PacifiCenter project, (or Douglas Park). The Land Use Subcommittee met on April 27, 2004, to discuss relevant documents and discuss project issues.*

*We find that the Boeing PacifiCenter project possesses many positive attributes, however, the project raises strong concerns from some members of the AAC. While not unanimous in its conclusions, the AAC does not fully support a residential component because of the potential hazards and problems noted in the Long Beach Airport Bureau's assessment, and because of many unanswered questions. Some members of the AAC membership are either neutral or supportive of a residential component consisting of 1,000 or fewer high-end owner occupied single-family units. This residential component could be aviation themed to attract residents who are supportive of aviation activity. It has also been suggested that hangars be constructed equal to 10% of the total residents built.*

Commissioner Veady stated that given that the Commission is not unanimous, the Subcommittee felt that a dialogue is necessary.

Commissioner Luskin stated that he is not in favor of the residential component, however, if there is a residential component, he is not vehemently opposed, and he would want to limit it to no more than 1,000 homes and that those homes or condominiums should be owner occupied. He stated that the idea of apartments creates transience. He stated that he is in opposition to the apartments, not vehemently opposed to single family, and that he would like to make the residential component aviation themed/related and would like to see hangars built along 25R, to encourage a homeowners association or board that is Airport related, so there is not a situation where they would want to close down the Airport, or at least Runway 16L, the runway most highly at risk.

Commissioner Soccio stated that she is a minority of one, and that she is in favor of housing. She stated that she does not believe that Airport noise would be a detriment to where the housing is planned. She stated that Boeing has given consideration to land use, aligning the roadway with Runway 16L, which she thought was a good idea. She stated that regarding the apartment component, that she feels Boeing has taken into consideration that they will not be the type of apartments that would attract a transient type of tenant, that they might be people more interested in the neighborhood than the average tenant. She stated that her questions have been answered satisfactorily from Boeing representatives.

Commissioner Clever stated that he is in agreement with Commissioner Soccio, and is in favor of the residential component.

Chairman Salk stated that, absent a motion, he would move that the memorandum previously read by Commissioner Veady be used as the report back to the City Council.

He stated that there are several other advisory groups giving their opinions and their expertise, and that the Commission's expertise relates to the Airport.

Commissioner Luskin made a motion that the memorandum read by Commissioner Veady, arrived at by the Land Use Subcommittee, would be used as the Commission's report on Douglas Park.

Commissioner Veady stated that a poll should be taken to see where members stand. She stated that the center of the issue is the residential component, whether or not it should be a part of the project.

Commissioner Soccio agreed that she believes that is the biggest issue.

Chairman Salk asked for a second to Commissioner Luskin's motion. Commissioner Veady gave the second.

Commissioner Haubert asked for a re-read of the memorandum.

*This memorandum is in response to a request of April 15, 2004, to recommend an official position for the Airport Advisory Commission regarding the Boeing PacifiCenter project, (or Douglas Park). The Land Use Subcommittee met on April 27, 2004, to discuss relevant documents and discuss project issues.*

*We find that the Boeing PacifiCenter project possesses many positive attributes, however, the project raises strong concerns from some members of the AAC. While not unanimous in its conclusions, the AAC does not fully support a residential component because of the potential hazards and problems noted in the Long Beach Airport Bureau's assessment, and because of many unanswered questions. Some members of the AAC membership are either neutral or supportive of a residential component consisting of 1,000 or fewer high-end owner occupied single-family units. This residential component could be aviation themed to attract residents who are supportive of aviation activity. It has also been suggested that hangars be constructed equal to 5%-10% of the total residents built.*

Commissioner Veady stated that if they modify the memorandum, it could be stated how many are in favor or opposed if they choose, or to leave the memo in more vague language.

Chairman Salk stated that the motion is to use that memorandum, and an amended motion would have to be made.

Commissioner Haubert stated that they could possibly come to a consensus that a majority of Commissioners do not support a residential component of 2,500 or 1,400. He stated that it is important that the Commissioners state that they oppose 2,500 or 1,400 units. He stated that the way the memorandum was worded does not fully support the residential component, which could be viewed as being weaker than saying a majority

oppose either 2,500 or 1,400. He stated that he believes that there is a consensus on the Commission that 2,500 or 1,400 are not appropriate. He stated that that would be his discussion of a possible substitute motion.

Chairman Salk asked if Commissioner Haubert stated that the Commission is going beyond their scope. Commissioner Haubert agreed and stated that the Commission should talk about the effect of the project on the Airport. He stated that the project site is an aircraft-manufacturing base and has been since development. He stated that the site history is impressive, and that he believes it will be redeveloped for the better. He stated that to keep in perspective the discussion, the project is not a bad project, even with the housing component, but he stated that he believes it could be made much better, by reducing the housing, possibly not eliminate it but reduce it, and have higher owner-occupied and fewer rentals. He stated that he would like to see an increase of commercial and industrial space to be used. He stated that a component of the report by Chris Kunze bothers him, that is, if the zoning change amendment were to take place all at once, according to Boeing, they would develop it according to market demands. He stated that that could mean that commercial and industrial would be shelved and housing would be built first, which means that later if a developer were to develop an office building, the residents could oppose it because it would be too close to the residents. He stated that he is worried that the residential component would be built, and then nothing else would be built. He stated that these are items discussed before and identified in Mr. Kunze's report.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that he is in agreement with Commissioner Haubert's comments, in terms of being more specific in their recommendations. He stated that the motion, the way it is written, would not be useful, and that there is nothing in evidence how the Commission feels. He stated that there are at least two Commissioners in favor of the project as proposed with the housing component, and with no comment on the size of that component. He stated that based on issues raised by Mr. Kunze, that they would be creating problems for the City by approving the project with the housing component. He stated that he does not feel strongly, and that it should be stated more specifically in the motion.

Commissioner Soccio stated that as the Airport Advisory Commission, they should look at it from a land use standpoint and that Boeing has looked at it in that manner. She stated that she does not believe that it would be in the City's best interest, or the neighborhood's best interest, to leave the project strictly commercial. She stated that Boeing has answered questions raised by Commissioner Haubert and that the retail is dividing the residential from the commercial.

Commissioner Temple stated that he understands that the request from Boeing is for entitlements. Boeing representatives agreed. Commissioner Temple stated that then Boeing would not be the developer. Mr. John Conk from Boeing stated that they are seeking entitlements, however, that does not preclude Boeing from being the developer or the master developer of the project. He stated that the decision has not been made that after entitlements, Boeing will be the master developer, building the infrastructure, which is likely to be the case, and after developing the backbone infrastructure, that parcels will be sold to developers for residential and commercial development. Commissioner Temple stated that then the City could be dealing with someone else other than Boeing in the development. Commissioner Temple stated that he opposes residential, and that if the City were to approve residential, he would suggest no more than 1,000 with no

apartments. He stated that the motion is too vague and should be shortened.



Commissioner Temple asked to make a motion. Chairman Salk stated that there is an amended motion already on the floor. Commissioner Haubert stated that Commissioner Temple could make a substitute motion.

Commissioner Luskin stated that he is in agreement with having his motion modified, as appropriate.

Commissioner Alton stated that if a spot were put in the center of the Airport and a radius drawn one mile around that spot, any residential in that circle, if under the flight path, will be affected. He stated that he understands that aviation theming might result in individuals with greater tolerance for airport noise. He stated that that may be the first wave of residents, but there is no guarantee of that through the life of that component. He stated that he is opposed to any housing component in the project. He stated that he does not like the fact that the Boeing Company only looked at three alternatives, no project, mixed use, and a container facility. He stated that he is not happy to make a decision between housing and a container lot. Mr. Conk stated that the alternative studied in the EIR included the project, a no project alternative, the reduced intensity alternative – the 1,400 unit plan-and an all-commercial alternative, which included a large portion of retail development as well as commercial development, which would include light industrial, not necessarily a container facility. Commissioner Alton stated that he is in favor of the last alternative.

Commissioner Temple made a substitute motion that should the City Council see in their wisdom to move forward with the project, that 25% of the land should be held back for airport oriented use of some type, and no more than a housing component of 1,000 residential units. Commissioner Temple stated that he is in agreement with Commissioner Luskin, that housing and hangars, or office space and hangars, something that is a buffer between the airport and the project, should be included. Vice-Chair Fox seconded the substitute motion.

Commissioner Haubert stated that he understands that the Commission has the flexibility to say the Commission opposes the project as it is, or can say we oppose it unless the residential units are lowered to less than 1,000, etc. He stated that at the last meeting it was discussed that a recommendation was needed before final comments on the EIR, and he stated that the answer was no, that this was the beginning of a long process, with zoning changes, and entitlements. He stated that Boeing has the right to use the land as aircraft manufacturing. He stated that a hotel could not be built there, housing could not be built there, a warehouse could not probably be built there. Commissioner Haubert defined Commissioner Temple's motion as being a two-part motion, suggesting that the Commission oppose any housing element that consists of more than 1,000 units, and the second part is that at least 25% of the total acreage be set aside for airport related uses which may include airport related housing. Commissioner Temple stated that that is exactly his motion.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that a portion of what Commissioner Veady read is that the Commission does not need to be unanimous, and that much is by consensus.

Commissioner Haubert stated that it would be his suggestion that the memorandum contain a statement that the Commissioners have been told that they are free to write their own views.

Commissioner Soccio asked if the memorandum could be itemized as it relates to land use and itemized related to housing. Commissioner Soccio stated that that would be a substitute motion.

Commissioner Veady stated that if the memorandum were modified to say “The AAC does not support a residential component consisting of 2,500 or 1,400 units”, that the Commission is in agreement with that statement. She stated that further in the memo it states that some members of the AAC do support a residential component consisting of 1,000 or fewer units, and that it could be added that it is also recommended that 25% of the land be set aside for airport related use. She stated that there are two changes, 1) to be clear on the number of units that the Commission is not supportive of, and 2) the final recommendation of holding 25% of the land for aviation-related use.

Commissioner Luskin stated that he would agree with that as a motion.

Commissioner Veady re-read the language for the motion as modifying the memorandum to include: “We find that the Douglas Park project possesses many positive attributes, however the project raises strong concerns from some members of the AAC. The AAC does not support a residential component consisting of 2,500 or 1,400 residential units”

Paragraph 3 reads the same with the exception of a final sentence saying: “in addition, it is recommended that 25% of the land be set aside for airport related uses.”

Commissioner Temple stated that he agrees with that motion and withdraws his substitute motion.

Commissioner Haubert stated that with that motion withdrawn, Commissioner Luskin’s motion is still valid, unless Commissioner Luskin would withdraw his motion, to be replaced by one read by Commissioner Veady. Commissioner Luskin stated that he would like to replace his motion with the modified version read by Commissioner Veady. Commissioner Temple seconded the motion.

Commissioner Alton stated that when talking about the 25% allocated land use for airport related uses, there was a mention that that could be used for housing, and does not want that number added onto any number that the Commission identifies. He stated that if it is the clear reading that Commissioner Veady gave, he is supportive, as it does not speak to any housing.

Commissioner Luskin stated that one of the changes is that the original motion said that 5%-10% of the number of single-family residences would be provided with hangars. He stated that the language eliminated hangars and replaced it with airport related uses. He stated that he prefers to be specific with hangars, but would consider the option.

Commissioner Alton stated to further clarify, the Commission is saying in the motion that they do not agree with 2,500 or 1,400, and that 25% of the space should be set aside for airport related uses.

Commissioner Veady stated that that is what the Commission is unanimous on, however, the Commission is not unanimous on the residential component of 1,000 units, or not at

all.

Commissioner Alton asked if they could remain silent on that issue.

Commissioner Luskin noted that a vote should be taken on the motion to see how many are for it and how many against it. He stated that any particular recommendation that is sent to the City Council needs to have unanimous approval. He stated that the Council will see that there are some for and some opposed.

Commissioner Veady stated that the motion states that some members are either neutral or supportive of a residential component consisting of 1,000 or fewer units.

Commissioner Haubert stated that he still sees a problem with the 25% allocation land use for airport related uses. He stated that the definition is not clear, and that a definition to aviation related, or airport related uses should be included. He stated that he would be opposed if there is not a market for that use, in that no aviation related office were interested, but Microsoft or someone else would want it, that it would be restricted to the point it was not used. He stated that he would like to maximize that property from a job creating point of view.

Commissioner Luskin stated that there is a demand for aviation related uses, and if the language is changed back to hangars, he could assure that every hangar would sell quicker than the homes. Commissioner Haubert stated that what if it were not hangars but office space for aviation related offices, and there is no market for that. Commissioner Luskin stated that his original motion was for 5%-10% to be provided in hangars.

Chairman Salk stated as the motion stands now, the language states aviation-related uses. Commissioner Luskin stated that he does not know what aviation-related uses means. Commissioner Salk asked Commissioner Temple what is his definition of aviation-related uses. Commissioner Temple gave an example of a corporate company in Kansas City or New York, that would want to establish an office at LGB, and that they may want to build a hangar with an office behind it, just as it could be a hangar with a house behind it.

Chairman Salk stated that the motion needs to be tightened and further defined.

Commissioner Luskin stated that in Mr. Kunze's presentation, one item on airport uses was that he did not want aviation-related businesses competing with established businesses. He stated that the language would have to consider that concept.

Commissioner Haubert asked Mr. Kunze to comment on the discussion of aviation uses. He asked if Mr. Kunze's report recommends that a portion of the Boeing property be reserved to aviation uses and how is that defined.

Mr. Kunze stated that in the specific report, which is staff's response to the draft EIR, it states that "finally on a different issue, any PacifiCenter on site aviation uses would present real opportunists to add uniqueness to the PacifiCenter commercial offerings, which could very positively increase its marketability and reinforce the suggested theming. It should be assured, however, that the relationship is one of providing direct access to the air transportation system via the Airport's runways". An example would be corporate

aircraft hangars with commercial office space, and not for the conduct of commercial aviation business on PacificCenter property that would compete with on Airport business and effectively lower Airport leasehold land values.” He stated that he also has a slightly more specific set of recommendations for permitted uses for aviation. Anything that exists there now, related to aircraft manufacturing is fine, aircraft storage, aircraft services provided by onsite property owners or tenants for their own aircraft are all fine, however, any such services cannot be made available on a commercial basis. He stated that generally the FAA requires that aircraft owners be allowed to work on their own aircraft. Aircraft access as needed for provision of air transportation to any Douglas Park based use would be permitted. Any or all-commercial aviation services provided by those holding valid leases, licenses, or permits to conduct business on Long Beach Airport property would be permitted. He stated that existing FBO’s could go on that site for fueling as an example. All aviation uses must meet all provisions of the City’s Noise Compatibility Ordinance, Airport Rules and Regulations, Airport Minimum Standards for Aeronautical Activities and be subject to any and all fees for like aeronautical uses.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that the definition should be made clear. He suggested that the motion be carried over, understanding that the Commission is in agreement in general with the principle that has been made by Commissioner Luskin, and that Commissioner Haubert be added to the Land Use Subcommittee and that Commissioner Veady and Commissioner Haubert form accurate language.

Commissioner Temple stated that he is in agreement with that and that he would be more comfortable having it all down in writing before a vote is taken.

Chairman Salk asked for protocol on if it is carried over, would they still have the motion on the floor. Commissioner Haubert stated that something has to be done with the motion and that they have to hear from the public before acting. He stated that continuing to carry it over to the next meeting, he understands that the 2,500 and 1,400 housing units is not appropriate, and the majority opinion of the Commission. He suggested a substitute motion that the Commission make a statement that they reject or oppose 2,500 and 1,400, but would like to review it further. He stated that it is important that they take a position as to that part of the motion assuming that that will not change.

Commissioner Clever stated if there were certain dates that the Commission had to follow. Chairman Salk asked Ms. Amy Bodek for a review of relevant dates and deadlines.

Ms. Bodek stated that if the Commission decides to carry the motion over and have a subcommittee meeting and bring the language back in July, that is still within an acceptable timeframe. She stated that the recommendation would still be considered with time for the Planning Commission and the City Council. She stated that with respect to Mr. Kunze’s definition of aviation related uses, those definitions were requested by Planning and Building and Community Development Departments, to craft appropriate language and a proposed zoning ordinance which would include appropriate aviation related uses. She stated that it is understood that there are certain aviation related uses that are not appropriate for the project, because they do not want them to compete with existing tenants. She stated that in the language that Mr. Kunze provided, there were points made which are being crafted into appropriate zoning language. She stated that the difference in this situation is that staff is not recommending exclusive aviation related uses for certain areas, but are recommending that those aviation related uses be one of

many uses that could occur in that area. Chairman Salk asked about the time frame, as there may not be a July regular meeting, and whether it could be held until August. Ms. Bodek stated that that would be cutting it close, and suggested to resolve the matter in July.

Commissioner Luskin stated that with some refining it could be completed. He stated that Commissioner Temple's motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Fox, referring to the aviation related uses, and applying Mr. Kunze's definition of what aviation related permitted uses are, would give it clarity.

Commissioner Haubert stated that since the subject is still in discussion, that he would oppose it, because he needs more time given the one element in the motion that he disagrees with. Commissioner Luskin asked what part he is opposed to. Commissioner Haubert stated that it is the 25% set aside for aviation related uses.

Chairman Salk asked for comments from members of the audience.

Ms. Candy Robinson, Long Beach Flying Club and AOPA representative, stated that her concern is that the Commission has not been tasked to redesigning the project. She stated that the task is yes or no regarding residential, 2,500 residential units, 1,400 residential units or all commercial. She stated that if the Boeing plan is endorsed with even one home, the positive relationship that general aviation has with homeowners would go away, and the community groups against the Airport would flourish gaining thousands of new members. She stated that the Airport users, local government, Airport sponsors, and the adjacent community, have to have a cooperative working relationship. She stated that Boeing Realty, as an element of the community, must do their part, and if the project passes the common sense test, it does not make sense to put housing on an Airport, where the project is encompassed by the traffic pattern for 25R. She referenced an AOPA handbook, which characterizes residential encroachment as an airport's death warrant. It states that "one of the most incompatible land uses near airports is residential encroachment. Residential encroachment places most stress on an airport because of complaints generated by individuals. In many cases, politicians in an effort to expand the tax or voter base, turn their backs on the airport, opting instead for short-term financial gain. Seldom do these elected officials have any understanding of the airport's economic impact on the community at large. New residents move near the airport knowing the Airport exists, however, once the sub division begins to flourish, these same residents begin to organize and pressure elected officials to do something about the noisy airport." She stated that the handbook sums up exactly what is going on in this area. She stated that the noise impact from the Airport has three tools: 1) control of the aircraft itself, by controlling high prop settings, maximizing climb rates, 2) the control of air traffic, and 3) compatible land use planning. She stated that the third tool of land use planning is in jeopardy.

Mr. Elliott Fried, Professor at Cal State Long Beach, former AAC member, and long time pilot, stated that he suggests that the AAC vote in favor of Douglas Park only if they are in favor of the following:

*"If you want to degrade the configuration of the surrounding neighborhoods, support Douglas Park. If you want the Airport to eventually lose Runways 25R, 16L, 16R, vote in favor of Douglas Park. If you want to create a toxic environment for thousands of homeowners and apartment dwellers to live in, vote for Douglas Park."*

*If you want to create a situation in which pilot error and mechanical malfunction, both of which occur on a regular basis in the real world of general aviation, can end up killing and injuring scores of people, by all means, vote for Douglas Park. In essence, if you want to position a dagger against the jugular of the Airport, this is by far the best means to accomplish it."*

Mr. Gene Lassers stated that since the last meeting, a significant business event took place. He stated that Virgin Airlines selected the City of San Francisco as their main base of operations to launch a new domestic airline, through an offering of enterprise zone state tax credits, which brought 1,500 new jobs. He stated that the only people that have looked into the development of the site is Boeing Realty. He stated that Boeing has painted commercial build-out with broad brush strokes and gray, for bringing attention to polluting and noisy trucks, big box warehouse and undesirable consequences. He stated that it is the Lakewood Task Force belief that further evaluation is required especially since the site is still under demolition for another 10 months, and in his opinion nothing would be lost by taking time to make the right decision.

Ms. Phyllis Ortman , 5302 E. Greenmeadow Road gave the following statement:

*"I am the President of the Lakewood Village Neighborhood Association representing more than 5,000 residents in Long Beach. We have been working with BRC for the past four years and have been slow to make a decision doing our research and gathering input. Our neighborhood residents have taken a position, not so much against residential as FOR jobs. Residents DO question why anyone would build housing under an airport and why any city would allow that to happen. We are equally as convinced that eventually Boeing will pull more of its operation out of Long Beach and THAT area East of Lakewood Blvd., we believe, would be more conducive to residential. Our residents view this plot of ground as the historic, prime job-producing property it always has been in this city. Not 15-20 years from now, but right now. The residents and leaders of Long Beach are being held hostage by a spin on numbers-we are being told by Boeing Realty that Long Beach is in a residential crisis-yet statistics show that Long Beach is currently ahead of its goal for residential development. We have 4,000+ new apartments going into the downtown area; we have another development of 7-story condos approved to go up on PCH-in fact, we have a potential unit total of nearly 5,000 apartments, condos and houses approved to go up in Long Beach right now! So what population DO you want in Long Beach? 500,000? 750,000? A million? More? Stop where? And how is the City of Long Beach going to support that population with already stressed city services? We are being told by Boeing that office space stands open, yet our own LB Business Journal relates that there is only an 8% vacancy rate in office space around the airport. The recent study conducted by the Watson Center indicates a low commercial vacancy in this area overall. Another study shows only 2% in the entire San Fernando Valley. Let's think about the next 30 to 50 years rather than 5-10 years? Where will the million+ residents-OUR children and OUR grandchildren- have to drive to go to work if Long Beach becomes more and more a bedroom community? Irvine? Norco? Riverside? San Bernardino? Do you know that studies completed by LA County indicate that EACH NEW JOB produces \$3,448 in tax revenue. 90% of that comes back in the form of local K-12 education and health services from the State's general fund. 5% directly back to the city, 5% to transportation-\$3,448 for EACH-NEW-JOB! It's on the County's website. Furthermore, do you know that for each \$100 invested in residential, the city gets back about \$.50 in taxes and spends \$1.50 in services while for each \$100 invested in commercial the city gets back \$7 in taxes and spends only \$.50 in services?? Let me repeat that: With residential: \$.50in, \$1.50 out. With commercial: \$7 in, \$.50 out! Long Beach City residents are saying to you: Please*

*STOP! Stop listening to a numbers spin! If you ask the residents which they would prefer for Long Beach-more housing or more jobs- what do you think they would say? Let's do something that makes economic sense for the future of Long Beach! This is a unique property:*

- 261 acres-where else can you find that in LA County?
- Adjacent to the 13<sup>th</sup> largest airport in the State of California
- ¼ mile from the 405 Freeway
- In a state which has an active campaign for economic/job growth
- A southern California "beach city", affordable as beach cities go and attractive for relocation
- A county which can support a wide-range employment base
- An established city w/commercial economic-privilege capabilities
- A city with six colleges, universities and major training centers
- The 5<sup>th</sup> largest city in CA w/cultural and entertainment activities
- In a neighborhood that desires a commercial complex- not a NIMBY bunch of neighbors! Where else can you find all that!

A unique property and a unique opportunity here to build our city's economy with jobs! We want JOBS! Our neighborhood association is meeting with our council members, the county, our state representatives and a representative of the state economic development office to bring a win-win for Long Beach-JOBS. Boeing has given what it's trying to sell Long Beach its best shot. Now Long Beach residents would like a turn-and we intend to win-we intend to win JOBS for the city of Long Beach-just as is currently being done in Van Nuys, San Francisco, Downey, Carson, Irvine-some with assistance from the state's Enterprise Zone State Tax Credits and some on their own.

Our City Manager and the city leaders a few years ago PRAISED Boeing's redevelopment plan when Boeing's spin was profitable numbers for research, high tech, light industrial and commercial-no residential. A few years have passed and now Boeing has a residential spin. Any good accountant will always spin numbers for his bottom line-whatever currently makes the most corporate profit- that's his job! Well, we have a job, too-OUR job as residents and city leaders is to spin our numbers for what's best for OUR bottom line. Our neighborhood believes that to be JOBS FOR LONG BEACH! Give us some time to conduct our meetings-time for JOBS FOR LONG BEACH!

Mr. Kevin McCachren, Long Beach Airport Association, stated that there was a situation in a World War II battle where General Mark Clark was pinned down by German brigade, and the leader of the German troops sent a message to General Clark asking if he was ready to surrender, General Clark sent a one word message "NUTS". He stated that the consensus of the Long Beach Airport Association regarding Boeing Realty's plan to put housing on an Airport, is the same answer: "NUTS".

Mr. Conk of Boeing Realty stated that they appreciate the Commission's comments as well as the public's comments, and stated that he would like to address the motion that was on the table, that will be discussed at the next meeting. He stated that in the second paragraph of the motion of May 14<sup>th</sup>, "while not unanimous in its conclusions, the AAC does not fully support the residential component because of potential hazards and problems noted in the Airport Bureau's assessment." He stated that at the last meeting Boeing went over those concerns that were pointed out in the Airport Manager's memo in response to the draft EIR. He stated that the sentence went on to say "because of many unanswered questions". He stated that he hoped that in the last presentation, any unanswered questions were addressed, and if not, Boeing would be happy to address them. He stated that if Boeing has answered all the unanswered questions, then he would like to suggest that that comment be removed from the Commission's statement.

He suggested that wording say that the Commission feels that Boeing is in compliance with all regulatory requirements for related land use next to Long Beach Airport. Regarding the suggestion to reduce the number of residential from 2,500 to 1,400 to 1,000, that he understands the concern regarding the number of residential units in the development, however, he asked if the reduction suggested - down to 1,000 units - was due to the 400 units which are proposed as apartments in the 1,400 unit project. He stated that currently, as proposed, the 1,400 units consists of 70% ownership units, and 30% for rent, and those for rent are the 400 units of the 1,400 units. He stated that if the Commission is opposed to the rental units, and that is the reason for the drop from 1,400 to 1,000, that he would like the Commission to state that the Commission is opposed to rental units. He stated that he is puzzled as to why 1,000 would be supported. If it is because of the apartment component, then he would like that written in the statement. He stated that regarding the discussion on the hangars, in the last paragraph of the recommendation, that it should be reconsidered to put in aviation uses versus specifically hangars. He stated that the currently proposed project includes the potential for aviation related uses. He stated that that does not insure that that area will be aviation uses. It could be, however, if the market is there for it. He stated that the area that is currently proposed for possible aviation uses, the area south of the street called "G" street, an extension of Conant Avenue west, it is that area between the property line and Conant, as well as the area in the City of Lakewood adjacent to the Airport. Whether that equals 25% of the project site is not known. He stated that 25% would be 60 acres, and that that area would be close to the noted area. He stated that regarding the phasing of the commercial development, there is a development agreement being negotiated between Boeing and the City of Long Beach, related to the commercial development, and the phasing of that development. He stated that the phasing requirement is that in order for Boeing to develop residential units, the commercial infrastructure must be built. There is a guarantee that as residential units are built, the commercial infrastructure, including the streets, utilities and landscaping sidewalks are completed, regardless of whether the market is there for commercial development. He again stated that the project is zoned for aviation related uses, and the site could be developed for office or R&D, or light industrial uses.

Chairman Salk suggested that the Land Use Subcommittee take the recommendation back and look at the wording. He stated that if more clarification is needed, to speak to Boeing, and bring it back to the next meeting.

Mr. Larry Boland, Lakewood Village, stated that he is not opposed or in favor of the residential however, for someone who has lived in Lakewood Village and has experienced the noise from Runway 25R for 30 years, it is not just light planes, it goes the gamut. He stated that if you want to maintain training on Runway 25R, with quiet single-engine piston driven airplanes, Cessna 152, 172, that you can't hear them. He stated that the acrobatic planes at 100 dB, can be heard, and there will be a problem if residential is built without controlling the noise. He stated that even if they sign an aviation agreement, there will still be 100+ complaints monthly, and because there is no measuring device north of the Airport it will be a problem. He stated that the single-engine piston driven airplanes will turn at Cherry and down Carson and go as loud as they want, because the Airport cannot monitor that noise.

#### **Commissioners Comments**

None

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted,



